CHURCH UNION

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

NEWS AND VIEWS

MAY 1958

'The Problem of Baptism'

CHURCH UNION

NEWS AND VIEWS

(New Series)

Vol. 3 | Organ of the Negotiating Committee for Church Union in North India and Pakistan | No. 2

CONTENTS

	Page
Editorial : ' Cast Not Away Your Boldness '	17
Church Union and Lambeth : by Rt. Rev. W. Q. Lash.	18
Baptism in the North India Plan of Union : by Rev. W. Stewart	19
The Problem of So-Called " Re-Baptism " : by Rev. E. L. Wenger	22
Anglican-Presbyterian Relations : by Rt. Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson	28
Letter to the Editor	31
Writers in this Number	Cover

Acting Editor : Rev. B. F. Price, Serampore College, Serampore, West Bengal.

Manager : *(To whom all subscriptions should be sent)* Rev. Dr. W. M. Ryburn, Theological College, Saharanpur, U. P.

Subscription Rates : India and Pakistan ... ... Rs. 2/0 per year.
U. K. and Europe ... ... 4s per year.
U. S. A. and Canada ... ... 00.50 per year.

Published quarterly in February, May, August and November of each year.

Material should reach the Editor not later than 25th of the month previous to intended publication.

subscription in U. K. and Europe may be paid through the Rev. Frank Short, Edinburgh House, 2 Eaton Gate, London S. W. 1.

Church Union

News and Views

(New Series)

"Cast Not Away Your Boldness"

WE are grateful to Bishop Lash for his article on "Church Union and Lambeth", which appears in this issue, and for the light which he throws on the nature of the discussions which will take place at Lambeth Palace from July 3rd to August 10th. We assure the Bishops of the C. I. P. B. C., and not least Bishop Lash, who will be largely responsible for presenting the North India Plan, of the support of our prayers as they travel to England at this time, and as they meet with their fellow-bishops of the world-wide Anglican Communion.

As Bishop Lash reminds us, at Lambeth "Baptism will naturally attract attention on account of our bold attempt to recognize two principles of administration of one Baptism." As Christians in North India and Pakistan who cannot but be affected by what takes place in England this summer, we would pray that the boldness of our North India Plan may be reflected in corresponding boldness of vision at Lambeth, both on the question of Baptism, and in the whole approach to Union. That it is not only at Lambeth, but also nearer home, that such boldness needs to be exercised, will be apparent as we read the three contributions on Baptism in this issue.

Negotiations out here have now reached the stage where the only alternatives are, on the one hand, going forward in faith, confident that God has a pattern for His Church in India which will be none the less His pattern if it fails to conform in every detail with what has been experienced in the West; or on the other, a cautious refusal to take risks without adequate security.

However precious our past traditions may be, no Church may so hedge round those traditions, whether regarding Baptism or the Ministry, that the past, in which God has undoubtedly been at work, can be allowed to frustrate the more effective working of His Spirit in this day and generation, not on our terms but on Him.

May we prayerfully seek for ourselves and for each other that forward-looking verdict in the Epistle to the Hebrews: "But we are not of them that shrink back unto perdition; but of them that have faith unto the saving of the soul."

We are very glad to report that the Rev. A. Stanley Jones, who represented the Methodist Church (British and Australasian Conferences on the Negotiating Committee on several occasions, has made a good recovery from the very serious injuries which he received while travelling by train earlier this year, and has been pronounced fit to travel home to England at the end of April. We thank God for his recovery and for the contribution which he has made to the cause of Church Union in North India.

Church Union And Lambeth

Rt. Rev. W. Q. Lash

LAMBETH Palace is the London home of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Nearly a hundred years ago a suggestion was made, first of all from Canada, if I remember rightly, that the Bishops of the Anglican Communion should meet together periodically for common consultation. Thus has grown up the custom of the Archbishop of Canterbury inviting his fellow Bishops to his home about once in ten years, war permitting. The Lambeth Conference has no administrative or executive authority. The Anglican Communion has developed along the lines of autonomous Churches in different regions of the world, which none the less keep close fellowship with each other. The Conference is a fruitful means of this fellowship. Another is the constant correspondence between the Metropolitans of the several regional Provinces.

Decisions on a Plan such as ours will be taken here in the Province of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon, and nowhere else. Before taking such decisions, our Canons lay down that we shall take the advice of the Lambeth Conference or of its Consultative Body (a kind of Standing Committee representative of the Provinces), before decisions are made. In the case of the Plan, the first meeting of the General Council of the C.I.P.B.C. since the publication of the Third Edition will not anyhow be held till early in 1960. So we can have the advice of the Conference itself without delaying our decisions.

The Conference discusses a variety of subjects, which almost always include the Unity of the Church. This time we have five subjects and five Committees to prepare Reports for the Plenary Sessions of the Conference to pass Resolutions upon. The Unity Committee has three sections. The largest of them, perhaps the whole Committee, will discuss 'Approaches to Unity', which include our own Plan, a Scheme for Ceylon, and an interesting Report of Relations with Presbyterians in Scotland and England especially. The others consider Ecumenicity and Particular Churches.

Usually a Committee of Theologians, appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, reports on a Plan or Scheme before the Conference. Such a Committee reported on the Ceylon Scheme some years ago and was generally favourable. The Committee, under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Derby (Bishop Rawlinson), and often called the 'Derby Committee' for short, only finished its work on our Plan at the end of March, so it is not yet published at the time I write this article. Bishop Noel Hall has been a member of it. Expert theological opinion carries considerable weight, and the Report will be worth studying for the assessment of trends of opinion.

Nevertheless, my experience of the last Lambeth Conference is that the Bishops come to Lambeth to make up their own minds, and among them are notable scholars from many parts of the world. The points in our Plan likely to occasion special attention are the proposals for the Unification of the Ministry and our provision for the Sacraments. Baptism will naturally attract attention on account of our bold attempt to recognize two principles of administration of one Baptism. Another more general question, which affects all Plans and Schemes of this kind, will be that of the relations a Church of the Anglican Communion may suitably have with a Church which has bishops but also is in relations of intercommunion with Churches which do not have them. This will involve the consideration of some kind of means of consultation among Churches, which have much in common in polity and doctrine, of a more intimate kind than is provided by the World Council of Churches.

Our own Province will naturally consider carefully the advice contained in the Resolutions and Reports of the Lambeth Conference but it will then make up its own mind. After the last Lambeth Conferences, for instance we came to decisions about the Church of South India which the Church of England did not reach till five years later, and the Protestant Episcopal Church of America has not yet reached. A Lambeth Conference does not dictate, but naturally enough we weigh carefully any conclusions which we ourselves have had our full share in reaching with our sympathetic and interested brethren from all over the world.

Baptism in The North India Plan of Union

Rev. William Stewart

(*Reproduced from 'Dnyanodaya' (March 1958) by kind permission of the Editor*)

Of the seven church bodies which are involved in the *Plan of Church Union in North India and Pakistan*, some practise Infant Baptism and some practise only what is termed "Believer's Baptism". In this respect the Plan differs from unions of Churches which have so far taken place. It will therefore be a great event for Church Unity generally if the Plan proves to be acceptable.

Even the possibility of agreement depends on a general principle underlying the Plan, namely that union need not wait for full accord on all points of difference. Many argue that union can take place only where there is such accord on details of Christian doctrine and practice; but this is to ask for what we do not find even within existing church bodies. There are differences inside our several churches today; but these do not drive us apart, for our agreements are bigger than our differences. In common dependence on our Lord, we are held together as a single family, within which debates can bear fruit in deeper understanding than is possible for any one person alone. If this is true in our various denominations, ought it not also to be possible on a wider basis?

To this question, the Plan of Union implies a clear answer "yes". Of course we do things differently, and have different ideas about Church government, forms of worship, the place of the sacraments and so on. Also, we have lived apart for so long that we have settled down into our own ways, and resent any outside criticism of our accustomed practices and doctrines. This is what makes it so difficult to expect a quick solution of our divisions, if we must first persuade others that their ways are wrong and ours right! We may convince one or two people now and then, but to convince whole organised churches would indeed be a major task and such "Union by Persuasion" would be a very long way off for us all.

Union by Comprehension

Is there another way? The Plan of Union is based on the idea that there is, a way which may be called "Union by Comprehension". This means that, with all our hearts, we recognise that the fact that we all belong to the one Lord is a much bigger thing than our differences and therefore it, rather than these differences, is what should determine how we live together. If to be 'in Christ" is the biggest thing of all, then the way must be found for us to live openly as His own, a single family in which we bear one another's burdens, not families divided as if our differences mattered more than our being one in Him. Thus the problem is not to settle the arguments first, but is to find how we can really form one visible company, with room in it for people who differ on even quite important matters, but are at one what alone is of first importance. Of course this is possible only where the truth of the Gospel itself is unchallenged, but, granting this, room must be left for differing conscientious convictions. The Plan of Union is an attempt to work this out.

This brings us to the question of whether differences between Baptists and others are of a kind which, though big, are yet not big enough to justify our staying apart. Discussions in the Negotiating Committee have shown both how large is the area of agreement and what is the real nature of the differences:

There is agreement, recorded in Chap. IV on the essential Christian Faith "which the Church has ever held in Jesus Christ the Redeemer of the world", as also about the authority of Scripture and the witness of the Creeds concerning that Faith.

Baptism

Then in Chap. VI, about Baptism, as "ordained by Christ Himself" there is this agreed statement:

> "Baptism is a sign of cleansing from sin, of engrafting into Christ, of entrance into the covenant of grace, of fellowship with Christ in His Death and Resurrection and of rising to newness of life." (VI. 2)

Differences arise as to the stage in a person's

life at which this Sacrament may properly be used, and as to the membership of the Church. All are agreed that, *in the life of the mature person*, it is by conscious faith that we accept the grace of God ; but the Baptist holds that, until this faith is awakened, it is not proper for a person to be baptised. He looks on personal confession of faith as an essential element in Baptism, which ought therefore not to be administered to a child who cannot make that confession. Consequently, the Baptist holds that Church membership is open only to those who have confessed their faith and have been received on that basis.

The paedo-Baptist does not agree. Being convinced, on Christ's authority, of God's love for the little children, he is sure that even in infancy these belong to "the covenant of grace" and ought to be received as members of the family of God, which is the Church, with the prayer that in due course their faith will be awakened in response to God's grace. When that happens, they will by faith lay hold on that grace, loving Him who first loved them, and will take their place as fully responsible members of His Church.

Here is a big difference of conviction and practice, and the problem is whether or not "Union by Comprehension" can make room for those who hold such different convictions. It is not a matter of seeking to persuade one or the other to change over but one of trying to find room for both, with full mutual respect, within the one Church organisation.

Baptism and Church Membership

In the Plan of Union, the attempted solution is found first in the section on Membership given in Chapter III. Here the way to agreement opened with recognition of the fact that there always are people of varying status within the Church's circle of responsibility. Thus it was realised that, on the Baptist side, children of believers are certainly regarded as "Christian children", within the Church's care, a fact expressed in the Baptist service of Infant Dedication. On the other side, it became clear that no one is given the status of fully responsible membership in the Church till he has come to conscious faith, which is sealed in a public service such as Confirmation. This double recognition made possible a statement about Church Membership which, on the one hand,

> "admits as members in full standing and as sharing in the full privileges and obligations of membership".

those baptised persons who have confessed their faith and have been openly received into that status, and, on the other hand affirms that certain other persons—including baptised and dedicated infants—

> "also share in the privileges and obligations of membership according to their capacity and status" (III. 2–6).

This statement does not commit th Church to the position of either the Baptis or of the paedo-Baptist. It is not the resu of successful persuasion either in the on direction or the other. It does make roo within a single structure, for persons of bot convictions, and so sets aside one barrier t visible unity.

In Chapter VI, the *Administration of Baptis* is dealt with. The common declaration c the meaning of Baptism is followed by statement that it is administered with wat in the name of the Holy Trinity. Thereafte two different practices are set out in detail alternatives, each of which is accepted proper in the united Church. In outli they are as follows :

(i) *In the case of those who practise infa Baptism* :

a. Infant Baptism ; b. Christian Nurtur c. Evidence of repentance, faith and lo towards Jesus Christ ; d. Profession of Fa at Confirmation ; e. Participation in Ho Communion.

(ii) *In the case of those who practise Believ Baptism* :

a. Infant Dedication ; b. Christian N ture ; c. Evidence of repentance, faith a love towards Jesus Christ ; d. Profession Faith at Baptism ; e. Participation in H Communion.

It is thought that, especially in the ea years after Union, these alternative paths normally be followed in different churc according to their previous practice ; people travel, so it is provided that i minister has scruples about baptising infa in case of need he may invite ano minister to perform the rite. What venture involves is also brought out i statement of "Guiding Principles", of w one of the most important is as follows :

"The Church...is keenly aware of the fact that divergence of conviction on this matter is something which can only be borne within one fellowship by the exercise of much mutual forbearance and charity. Nevertheless it believes that it is called to make this act of faith in the conviction that it is not the will of the Lord of the Church that they who are one in their faith in Him should be divided even for such a cause as this. It further believes itself to be called to this venture in the confidence that in brotherly converse within one Church, those of diverse convictions will be led together in the unity of the Spirit to learn what is His will in this as in other matters of difference."

Another Problem

We have dealt with the main problem, but nsideration has also been given to a pos- ble difficulty if a person who was baptised infancy later reaches the conviction that ily Believer's Baptism is proper. Clearly ch a person could follow his conviction by fraining from having his own children ptised. But what if he should feel that he mself should now be baptised as a believer?

All who care for Church Union hold rongly that conscientious scruples must be spected and not merely over-ridden. For is reason, it is agreed that a pastor, who is to deal with such a person, must not just y down what is "the rule of the Church", it try to help him to understand the reasons r that rule, and, in case of special difficulty, is directed to seek the help of the Bishop, e chief pastor of his area. At the same me, it is to be kept in mind that Baptism is ot just a private matter, affecting only the rsonal conviction of an individual. No ie baptises himself. Each one is baptised someone else, who acts as a minister of e Church, and this is the Sacrament of mission to the Church. This means that, a person asks to be baptised again, he is t just asking for freedom to do something ich he thinks proper, but is asking *someone* e to do something for him, which ignores at has already been done. The minister ncerned is asked to act as if the earlier Baptism had never taken place, in spite of the fact that Infant Baptism is solemnly recognised by the Church as one of the modes of administration of this Sacrament. It is this fact which has made it impossible for the Negotiating Committee to agree that there can be any repetition of Baptism itself, though no one can foresee what particular circumstances may in a specific instance give rise to genuine doubt as to whether the person concerned had actually been previously baptised.

As we think of this matter, we realise that similar difficulties can arise in other situations. For example, even in Baptist circles, there are sometimes young people who come to Baptism not out of inner conviction but perhaps because they are going to be married and it is expected of them. Later on, such persons may have a real conversion experience and for the first time realise what faith is. Now, none of the negotiating churches would think it right for such a person to be rebaptised at this stage. That at his Baptism he professed a faith which was not real is a matter of great regret, but it does not alter the fact that the promise of God which was declared in the Baptism was a faithful promise. What is now called for, therefore, is an act of penitence and faith which turns to God who can overrule what has been done amiss and who makes all things new. Just in the same way, the person who has come to regret that he was baptised, before he was old enough to understand, can none the less accept the fact that this did indeed happen to him—as so many other things happen to us while we are children, without our choice!—and can now, by patience and faith give his own response to the grace of God which was then declared towards him. Along these lines, the "Guiding Principles" point out an answer to his perplexity in these words:

> "the ministers of the Church will help such a person to seek the remedy of what he now believes to be a grave lack in his own Baptism, not by re-baptism, but by some other means which effectively reaffirms his Baptism and symbolises for him his engrafting into Christ."

The Problem of So-Called "Re-Baptism"

Rev. E. L. Wenger

THE Church Union Sub-committee of the Council of Baptist Churches in Northern India (namely the churches associated with the B. M. S.) last November took note that the revised form of Appendix B in the Plan of Union appears to be "generally interpreted outside Baptist circles as implying that a person baptized in infancy cannot at all be baptized as a believer even if his desire is 'final and conscientious'.....It was noted that a rigid interpretation implies a serious restriction on the liberty of conscience of the believer, which has been a cardinal point of Baptist tradition, and that a rigid interpretation on this point would lead one to expect a rigid interpretation on other points which were not fully defined on the ground that the United Church will expect the guidance of the Holy Spirit in matters as they arise, and in consequence many Baptists who otherwise would accept this Plan will feel obliged to vote against it. It was resolved: that enquiry be made of the Chairman and Secretary of the Negotiating Committee as to whether the Appendix did admit of the more liberal interpretation that many Baptists have given to it or not."

The Chairman and Secretary of the Negotiating Committee replied very courteously to the questions raised, but only in their personal capacity. It seems necessary therefore to raise the matter once more in the pages of "Church Union: News and Views" in the hope that further discussion may make clear a way to remove this hurdle. By "rigid interpretation" we mean an interpretation that holds unconditionally to the idea that baptism, whether as an infant or as a believer is quite unrepeatable, and therefore when according to App. B. 7. cases of conscience are referred to the Bishop for "pastoral advice and direction" the Bishop is precluded from giving permission for baptism. By a "liberal interpretation" we mean an interpretation which allows for permission for baptism to be given when the Bishop is satisfied that the person concerned is genuinely and sanely convinced that this is the will of Christ for him. In that case Appendix B sets out the general principle that baptism is unrepeatable, but admits for pastoral exceptions in cases of conscience: just as chapte XIV of the Plan asserts the indissolubility c marriage but allows for modification of th strict letter of the law.

The issue involved is urgent, and the fina decision of many Baptists on the question o union will turn on this test point: whethe in the last resort, subject to reasonabl safeguards, the liberty of conscience of th believer and his ultimate responsibility t God alone is to be upheld, or whether th reference of cases of conscience to the Bisho will meet with an inevitable "No". Th matter has come to the fore in many discus ions, whether (to name two examples) a con ference at local level of Baptists and Anglican in the "24 Parganas District of West Benga or in the Church Union sub-committee c the B. M. S. in London. A report in th "British Weekly" of 23. 1. 58 refers t Church Union negotiations in Jamaica, wher the "commission agreed to be guided by th schemes of Ceylon and North India. Th problem of unification of ministries presen little difficulty, but there is resistance on th part of the Disciples of Christ to the specifie rejection of the possibility of re-baptizin persons who had been baptized as infants" This issue is not just a local idiosyncrasy of few Baptists. Baptists feel that paedo-Baptis are still unaware of the seriousness of th issue. Many Baptists, who are critical of th Plan of Union as a whole, regard the negati implication of Appendix B as an "outstan ing illustration of its inadequacy". Othe who feel the urgency of Union are distresse that here should be a hurdle that they cann surmount. Some Baptists, indeed, hold th by accepting the Plan of Union they a bound not to ask for provision for su believer's baptism of those baptized infancy: and the fact that some Baptists ha taken this line has probably misled paed Baptists into thinking that this is not serious problem.

It is necessary therefore to make o further attempt to call the attention of paed Baptists to the seriousness of the problem they wish Baptists to enter into the Unio

may of course be the case that to try to eet Baptists at this point will seem to them o big a price, for it is a matter of conscience at the United Church must at all costs sist on the absolute unrepeatability of ptism in the lifetime of any one person, owever unreal and meaningless the baptism nich he is told that he had in infancy may em to him, and however convinced he may that it is Christ's will that he should ofess his faith in a baptism actively received. so we must conclude that the Plan of nion cannot accommodate those with ptists convictions, and both the United urch and the Baptists will be the poorer r the continued separation. But there pears to be a real desire on the part of any paedo-Baptists and many Baptists yet fulfil the Lord's will for unity in spite of vergences of conviction and practice: one ore attempt to set out the issues may erefore be made.

It is probably not realised how many, at ast in Britain, who ask for believer's baptism ve already received sponsored baptism. recent years about one-third of the candi-ates offering to the B. M. S. have been ptized on profession of faith, though they d previously received sponsored baptism. hese figures may sound an alarm! But it ust be remembered that one who comes in aturer years to the conviction that believer's ptism is the only proper baptism, cannot ter the *Baptist* ministry without himself ceiving baptism as a believer, even though considered his own baptism in infancy ot altogether invalid but merely defective d irregular; whereas in a *united* Church ch a person could continue to minister, ithout seeking re-baptism, even though he clined to administer baptism to infants in ture.

Some Baptists who are dissatisfied with ppendix B may yet be willing to take the sk of entering union on the present Plan in e strong expectation that such cases of nscience will undoubtedly occur and that e united Church will have to allow such ptism or find its members taking baptism tside its fellowship. This is already ppening in South India as it is in Britain. he question that will then arise is: what sciplinary action will be taken? Will such rsons be debarred from holding office but lowed to remain in membership (as happens, understand, in the C. S. I., where the services of some keen consecrated laymen have been lost to the Church as a result), or will they be excluded from membership? As the Chairman of the B. M. S. put it in a recent letter: "No one wants to see a Church come into being with a split in it already visible."

Certain points are made in objection to the request from the Baptists:

1. The first is that "the United Church is committed to recognition of infant baptism as a valid form of the one baptism. How then can it conscientiously recognize a form of service in which the validity of that ceremony as baptism is implicitly, if not explicitly, denied?" In answer to this it may be noted that quite clearly there is a distinction to be made between the official declarations of the United Church, which may be taught in the name of the Church, and certain private interpretations. This, for instance, is explicitly declared with reference to the "historic episcopacy". In the section on Infant Baptism, at one stage a responsible body of Baptists requested that the following words should be inserted before the words defining the meaning of infant baptism, "for those who practise infant baptism", thus indicating that they could not agree that in *their* eyes infant baptism was such a sign. Most of us, however, did not wish so to air our differences of interpretation within the Plan, and this proposal was not pressed. But it must *not* be understood that, while we are willing to "tolerate" infant baptism out of respect for those who regard it as vilid, that this means that in our own hearts we believe that it is valid. So long as those who are so baptized are convinced that this is the will of God for them we will not call in question their conviction of its validity. Of course those Baptists, who feel that Infant Baptism and Believer's Baptism cannot at all co-exist in the same church, totally deny the very validity of the infant baptism; but in trying to meet their objections we have pleaded the Baptist principles of liberty of conscience; and if the person concerned is satisfied that he is doing Christ's will we will not deny his conviction, since in other ways we hold so much in common; but it is on the very same ground that we expect that a person who is convinced that his baptism in infancy is not Christ's will for him, will also find respect for his conviction. See Appendix C: Baptist Declara-

tion). Admittedly this appears to make the "validity" of baptism a subjective matter of faith: but is there any "objective" which is not criterion for validity of baptism just as much a matter of the faith and teaching of a particular church?

2. The second point made is by way of comparison with the problem of ordination in relation to the Unification of the Ministry, it being urged that "re-baptism is strictly speaking as illegitimate as re-ordination". The comparison is admissible. It may be noted that non-Anglican presbyters are to receive the laying on of hands from, amongst others, an Anglican bishop. It is stressed that this is not re-ordination, but there is a recognition that there may be difference of interpretation of this rite. If the Plan had made the statement "this is not ordination" (omitting the prefix "re"), there would certainly be objections from some Anglicans, who, while not denying that other presbyters had had some sort of recognition service in their own churches which had passed under the name of ordination, yet hold that there were certain elements lacking in it, (e. g. the "intention" to make a priest with power to grant absolution) which only a real "ordination" can bestow. The ceremony of laying on of hands from a bishop at the Unification of the Ministry is clearly intended to meet the scruples of certain Anglicans, who cannot publicly say that these non-Anglican presbyters have now (and only now) been properly ordained, but they are able to think so in their own hearts. Some Baptists strongly object to this "subterfuge" as it seems: but many of us realise that we have to try to meet the conscientious convictions of others, acknowledging that we still do not see very clearly on all that is involved, and we are willing to meet them so, provided that the official interpretation does not compromise our position. Similarly Baptists agree that Baptism can be given only once in the lifetime of any one person, but since there were defects of intention on the part of the person concerned when baptized as an infant, the one and only Baptism that he receives is when the intention is present. From a Baptist point of view it would have been better to re-word para 6 of Appendix B by speaking of a person "who has already been *Christened* in infancy", who would "seek the remedy of what he now believes to be a grave lack in his own *Christening* not by re-baptism"—but by *Baptism*!

Baptists who seek Church Union in spite of their insistence on this issue have so far supposed that para 4 of Appendix B was to be taken seriously. They are prepared to "make this act of faith in the conviction that it is not the will of the Lord of the Church that they who are one in their faith in Him should be divided even for such a cause as this". They did hope that "in brotherly converse within one Church those of diverse convictions will be led together in the unity of the Spirit to learn what is His will in this as in other matters of difference." But if the rule of the Church on this matter of difference is an absolute "impossible", if the Holy Spirit is to be forbidden in advance from ever guiding a Bishop to exercise discrimination in this matter, then the hope expressed in para 4 becomes a piece of empty verbiage.

3. A third point stresses that the United Church also has a "conscience" as well as the individual member: that if baptism has been administered in the Church in the Name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit the Church cannot tolerate this being done again within its fold; otherwise by one act it will be denying another act done in its name. There is logic in this. Yet one sees here Leviathan Redivivus: the omicompetent Church maintaining its "conscience" over against the puny individual believer who dares to have a different conscience. It is almost laughable, if it were not pitiable, that so powerful a Church should feel its "conscience" affronted, not because some member was apostate or murderer or guilty of gross sin, but because some one in humility, after prayerful discussion with a presbyter of the Church, was listening to the demand of Christ upon his will. Baptists remember Thomas Helwys, Roger Williams and others who were the pioneers for real religious freedom, in that they claimed it not for themselves alone, but for all men, including those who did not agree with them. Liberty of conscience is the first corollary of faith in Christ, for a faith not held in freedom is no faith but received opinion. Baptists can make no contribution to a united Church unless they bring these insights of faith and freedom with them.

This insistence on the unrepeatability of baptism, because it is a Sacrament of the Church, becomes rather hollow when one

considers the way in which infant baptisms on a mass scale are sometimes practised. In the same number of the "British Weekly" quoted above there is a trenchant article by a Congregationalist minister in Glasgow. "All over Scotland", he says Sacrament is administered to the children of parents whom the minister *knows* don't care twopence for the Christian faith. It is just the "done" thing. Some men doctor their conscience (and the Word of God) by having first and second-class baptisms. Children of members in the Church. Others in the vestry. One man sat in his vestry twice a week and mothers queued to the door carrying their babies. Half-a-crown a time and a rubber stamp for the Birth certificate." Mr Nelson Gray goes on to speak of the difficulties faced by a minister who attempts to make a stand on principle. He ends by asking "Do we take the Sacrament of Baptism seriously–in practice at any rate? It is too common nowadays to sprinkle with a wink in doubtful cases." This may be rather outspoken: but is it not true? Are Baptists being very perverse if they find it hard to take seriously the contention that if a person has been baptized like this, even in the vestry for half-a-crown, he has been validly and effectively baptized and is debarred from making his profession of faith by baptism when he can think for himself? That Church must have a strange "conscience" if it can allow its ministers to baptize infants in this way, but view with horror one who dares to question whether his infant baptism was valid.

The problem then before Baptists is whether Appendix B is sufficient to meet their case, whether the liberal interpretation that they claim can be sustained. A summary of the events leading to the construction of this Appendix will show that at times the possibility of such a liberal interpretation was there.

In the Negotiating Committee of 1953 and in the Continuation Committee of January 1955, a liberal spirit prevailed. A critical point came in 1953, when a Baptist request on this issue had been voted down by four delegations to one: but Bishop Pickett realizing that such voting would not engender the spirit that leads to union begged leave for re-consideration of the motion, and the matter was referred to a sub-committee. That sub-committee did useful work. Through succeeding difficulties the example that Bishop Pickett had shown had encouraged us that there was a will to unity which would understand and surmount difficulties. At the 1955 session of the Negotiating Committee considerable sympathy was shown (albeit not unmixed with doubt) to the proposal for the "re-affirmation of baptism", and one member of the Baptist delegation regretted that we had not pressed for a vote then and there. But it seemed better to study this issue further. Up to this point the position seemed to be that while the rule of the Church was clear, provision could be made for "pastoral exceptions".

The phrase in para 7 of the Appendix had read as: "refer to the Bishop of the Diocese for decision", which we understood to mean that the Bishop would "decide" whether the case was genuinely one of conscience, and, if so, permit "baptism". At the Negotiating Committee of 1955 the word "decision" was replaced by "direction",–a seemingly softer word, and the sentence added "Principles for the guidance of the Bishop are to be further considered". Further discussions in sub-committee showed that we were not yet in a position to draw up such "Principles" since it would be better for Bishops within the united Church to consult one answer and to work out procedure in the light of actual events. So far there still seemed room for pastoral exceptions to the general rule. But conversations with some members of the Negotiating Committee suggested that in some dioceses the bishop's answer would never be anything but "No", and at the final meeting of the Negotiating Committee the phrase was amended to "for pastoral advice and direction". This phrase sounds sweeter, and I understand that it was offered by someone as making it easier for Baptists to accept, but in reality it implies that a person, who has successfully survived the persuasions of a presbyter with paedo-baptist convictions, is now to be subjected to a further dose of the same kind from the Bishop himself, with no hope of avoiding the inevitable "No".

It may be further noted that, presumably by accident, this issue was not taken up for discussion at the final meeting of the Negotiating Committee at Pachmarhi in April 1957 till the last morning, when everyone was feeling the urge to cut short discussion and pass the Plan.

The proposed amending phrase was passed

quickly. Other less weighty issues had been taken on earlier days and referred to sub-committee, who worked at night to clear up difficulties and face implications: not so with this issue. The vote on the Plan as a whole was taken shortly after. No one wished to break the unanimity with which the Plan as a whole was forwarded to the churches for decision: yet some at least gave their vote with some reservation. There was, however, still a ray of hope: the sub-committee was re-formed to continue discussions on this point. This ray seemed indeed rather slender, since of the Baptists appointed to it, one is now working in an area where he is not in touch with Baptist churches, and the other has in the pages of the "Church Union News & Views" expressly disassociated himself from the considerations urged in this article. The formation of this committee therefore gave grounds for doubt as to how far the Negotiating Committee realised the seriousness of the problem. The hope was, however, there. But nearly a year has passed, and that sub-committee has not met. The doubts have much increased, and the hope has grown fainter. This article is therefore a last attempt to ask other churches to think further about this matter before it is too late.

* * *

The Editor and Mr. Wenger have kindly allowed me to see this important statement on Baptist difficulties, giving me the opportunity to add some comments. In doing so I am giving my own personal views, and I cannot now, any more than when the Baptist Church Union Sub-committee referred to me last November, presume to commit the Negotiating Committee in any way.

It has been clearly recognised, since the Baptist Churches returned to negotiations in 1951, that union must for many of their members involve special difficulty. Members from other Churches will continue to practise and recognise infant Baptism, while strict Baptists will not do so. And from time to time there may arise the special problem of one who, himself baptized in infancy, comes in later years to adopt the Baptist view and to ask conscientiously for what to him will be a first real Baptism, but to others a second. We cannot expect either side to convert the other to its view prior to union; we believe that in union the Holy Spirit can guide us to a deeper understanding and agreement. Appendix B, and especially its 4th para., sets this out clearly enough, and I find the same view very clearly set out in the Baptist Summary of the Plan, sections 15 to 19. I note especially the statement, "The issue is not closed. Instead there was reluctance to make provisions of this kind a matter of rule. A special committee is to study it further, and it is firmly believed that as this is faced as a pastoral issue within a united Church, the Holy Spirit will guide the Church on each occasion."

Mr. Wenger complains that the committee has not met. The fact is that, though a whole year has passed since our Pachmarhi meeting, not one of the sub-committees there appointed has met. Should we infer that none of the further issues and tasks are considered important? I get the impression rather that, after our supreme effort in achieving an agreed Plan at Pachmarhi, we have been tempted to sit back and wait to see what happens. I deplore that as much as Mr. Wenger does, though opinions may differ as to how much further this particular sub-committee can get before union. In any case it will not do to be hustled into a decision at this stage either ruling out all possibility of a solution, or, on the other hand, committing the united Church to the practice of a "second Baptism" under certain special conditions.

Perhaps I may attempt to suggest where, as I see it, we need to explore things further and to explore them together before any Church can commit itself.

We should agree, I think, that Baptism involves (a) the individual baptized, (b) the Church which performs the rite, and (c) God. The emphasis will vary.

(a). Where our attention is specially given to the individual, Baptism may tend to be regarded primarily as the expression of the individual's repentance and faith,—something which he *does* to express and seal his own religious experience. If this were all, Baptism might be repeated every time there is some new spiritual experience to express. The individual may come to be dissatisfied with a Baptism received as a 'believer', and not only with an infant Baptism. But no one of

us would contemplate an unlimited repetition of the rite, just because we cannot confine ourselves to so individualistic a view of Baptism.

(b) We recognise to some extent, at least, the corporate character of Baptism as the act of the Church, admitting to an objective membership. There is an act openly done in and for the Church, before witnesses; providing a criterion of membership in a way which is not open to us when we are considering the intention of the recipient, or when by faith we are assured of God's acceptance and forgiveness.

Cases of genuine doubt may arise where a 'conditional Baptism' can be justified. But can the united Church be expected to question, and so repeat, its own act of Baptism, or that of any other recognised Church? We must fully recognise the need constantly to see that the Church in its practice is being faithful both to the need of the individual and to the gracious purpose of its Lord, and there is much heart-searching in these days over the somewhat indiscriminate methods which have obtained in the established Churches in the United Kingdom. But we must not, on such grounds, just sweep aside any recognition of Baptism as a sacrament of the Church.

Nor can I follow Mr Wenger in suggesting that it is a matter of the super-conscience of some mythical 'Leviathan' over-ruling the conscience of the poor individual. Rather, I should hold, must the individual, in exercising his own conscience, give consideration to that of his brother in the Church, whether it be that of the minister called to perform the rite in the name of the Church, or that of other members within the congregation of the faithful. If he determines to act regardless of his brethren in the fellowship, he is failing at the vital point of charity, as St. Paul so clearly recognised. I do not think that an 'ex-Baptist' Bishop would decide a pastoral problem regardless of how his brother Bishops will regard it. The problem can be solved by understanding and agreement within the fellowship, rather than by individual assertion of freedom or authoritarian imposition of rigid rules. That consideration does place a special burden upon the Baptist brother, which he has frankly to face.

(c) The Church, through its ministry, acts in the name of its Lord, and it is He who receives the 'child' in Baptism, whether infant or believer. Can we regard His action in so doing merely as a response determined either magically by the correct formula used, or by the action and correct intention and faith of the individual baptized? Will He refuse the assurance of His forgiveness and grace unless the individual adopts the particular method of a 'second Baptism' which he has been led to desire as the mode of that assurance? It is by grace that we are saved, and in and by His grace that we are baptized. The individual and his conscience surely have a part to play, but within a whole context which should include these other considerations. And it is within this larger context that I think we shall come to find that Mr. Wenger's suggested alternative between a "rigid interpretation" which makes the whole issue a matter of rule, and a "liberal interpretation" which makes exceptions dependent on a recognition of the conscience of the individual, is really inadequate. We are not at present in a position to commit ourselves to either of these so-called alternatives. Indeed I cannot myself see (and here I give my own view) how, until we have been able to get a good deal further in the process of "growing together" in unity, we can press for the admission of a "second Baptism" without being involved in a breach both of that respect for conscience and of that will to unity which we are all striving to promote. It is as we come together, in obedience to the will of our Lord, that I believe that we shall be led into the way through this, as through other difficulties which may at the moment appear to be almost insuperable.

T. Donald Sully.

The Marathi translation of the Plan has now been published, and is available from the Christian Book Shop, 84 Sankli Street, Byculla, Bombay 8 (price 35 nP. per copy).

The Secretary of the Bengal Christian Council reports that the Bengali translation is in the press, and should be available during the second half of May.

Anglican-Presbyterian Relations

Rt. Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson

(Reproduced from 'The Expository Times' (November 1957) by kind permission of the Editor and the publishers, T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh).

THE recently published Joint Report on *Relations between Anglican and Presbyterian Churches* has been described by the Archbishop of Canterbury as setting 'a new standard for inter-Church discussion,' and as being destined to be 'known as a landmark in the work of Church union.' A Presbyterian divine remarked recently that 'when the fire had died out in the heather, and when the blood was off the claymore,' the Report might be expected to bear lasting fruit. The Churches on both sides of the Border have wisely contented themselves for the present with the reception of the Report and the commendation of it for study. We who produced the Report were not asking, in the first instance, for more than this. Not until the rank and file of the membership of the four Churches immediately involved has spent some considerable time in thought, study and prayer, will the time be ripe for the taking of definite decisions: and when the decisions at last are taken, it is to be hoped that those who take them may be at the same time humble and penitent, irenic and realistic.

There had been earlier discussions between representatives of the Churches of England and of Scotland—that is, between two 'established' or 'national' Churches; and the representatives of the Episcopal Church in Scotland and of the Presbyterian Church of England taking part in these earlier discussions had been present only as 'observers.' The facts that, in respect of the Conversations of which the Report is now published, (1) the initiative on the Anglican side was no longer that of the Archbishop of Canterbury, acting in virtue of his office but without any particular 'mandate' from the Church, but had been assumed by the Convocations of Canterbury and York, whose members requested His Grace to take action; and (2) that nominees of the Episcopal Church in Scotland and of the Presbyterian Church of England this time took part on equal terms with their brethren and as persons accredited by their respective Churches to do so, brought it about that, in the Report which has just been published, the conferring delegates consider (as the Archbishop of Canterbury expresses it) 'not the relations between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland, but the more fundamental and fruitful subject of the relations between the Episcopalian and Presbyterian systems of Church order.'

Theological disputes between the upholders of Presbyterianism and the champions of Episcopacy go back far into history. Professor Norman Sykes in his recently published *Old Priest and New Presbyter*[1] makes it clear that the Presbyterians were first in the field in claiming that their system was alone consonant with the teaching of Holy Scripture, and that Episcopacy ought to be everywhere abolished. In England in the time of Queen Elizabeth I the Presbyterian position was stoutly maintained by the formidable controversialist Thomas Cartwright, who held the Lady Margaret Chair of Divinity at Cambridge, and who argued for a Presbyterian 'parity of ministers.' The champions of Anglicanism in this period were content to draw a distinction between matters for faith, with respect to which orthodoxy was indispensable, and questions of 'ceremonies order, and the kind of Church government,'[2] with respect to which there was 'no one certain and perfect kind of government prescribed and commanded in the Scriptures to the Church of Christ.'[3] In England the 'godly prince,' who, as Sykes points out, had 'captured the imagination of the sixteenth-century Reformers as the "*shaliach*" has done that of some contemporary exegetes,'[4] had prescribed Episcopacy, and the Anglican reformers were 'at pains to restore the godly bishop, in contradistinction to the corrupt prelacy of the later Middle Ages, against which they had revolted.'[5]

---

[1] See review in 'Church Union News and Views', May 1957.—Ed.
[2] Hooker, *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, III., ii. 2.
[3] Whitgift, *Works*, 1., 180.
[4] Sykes, *op. cit.*, 6
[5] Sykes, *op. cit.*, 12ff.

The Anglican contention at this time was, in short, that since there was no one particular form of Church government specifically enjoined in the Scriptures (the Presbyterians were in error in supposing that the Scriptures enjoined Presbyterianism), the reformed Episcopal system, as it existed in England under the aegis of the 'godly prince,' was a form of Church government which was *lawful* for Christians, and which was not contrary to God's Word. Later Anglican schools made a more positive claim for Episcopacy, holding that it exists in the Church by Divine ordinance, and that the lack of it in many Churches of the Reformation is a definite defect, only excusable (if at all) on the ground of historical circumstances and necessity.[1] A Presbyterian lay theologian, Mr. J. M. Ross, has suggested that 'it may have been the vehemence and persistence of the English Puritans' claim for the divine right of Presbytery that eventually broke the patience of the Episcopalians and led some of them to make a corresponding claim for Episcopacy.'[2]

The Church of England since the rise in 1833[3] of the Tractarian Movement has included within itself a school of thought, increasingly influential, whose valuation of Episcopacy has gone further. The High Churchmen of Caroline times and later held that Episcopacy, being of Divine ordinance, was of the *bene esse* of the Church. The newer 'Anglo-Catholic' teaching, based on the doctrine or fact of Apostolical succession, affirmed that bishops in true descent from the Episcopate of primitive times were the *indispensable* ministers of ordination, and that the sacrament of Holy Orders could *only* be bestowed by their means. Emphasis came to be laid increasingly on continuity of Orders from ordainer to ordained, and on the idea of transmission of authority in a succession going back in principle, and perhaps (as it was claimed) also in fact, to the original Apostles commissioned by Christ (cf. Jn. 20 : 21). Almost all Anglicans value the fact that in England, at the time of the Reformation crisis, continuity of ordination through the Episcopate was preserved unbroken, though at the time rather as a consequence of the conservative policy of the Crown than of any insistence on the part of theologians; and the Church of England within its own borders consistently acts on the principle, inherited from pre-Reformation centuries, that a bishop is the proper minister of ordination. It is in conformity with this principle that if a minister of a non-Episcopal Church comes over to the Church of England and desires to minister therein, he must before doing so be ordained according to the Anglican rite : whereas the already ordained minister of an Episcopal Church, if he turns Anglican, is received in his existing orders and is allowed to minister in the Church of England on condition simply of an assent to Anglican formularies and of conformity to Anglican discipline.

The Tractarians and their successors have drawn inferences from this difference of requirement, and have argued that the Church of England, on a true reading of its formularies, must be held to regard ordination by bishops as, in the strictest sense, theologically necessary. It is also to be noticed, however, that Article XXIII. ('of ministering in the congregation') says only that those Ministers are to be judged 'lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lord's vineyard'; and that the Anglican Ordinal, though it prescribes that when deacons or priests are ordained there shall be a sermon preached declaring 'how necessary that Order is in the Church of Christ,' does not make any such prescription as to the theme or argument of the sermon to be preached on the occasion of the consecration of a bishop. Actually in the Church of England there has for centuries been a divergence of view with respect to this matter, and any attempt either to enforce the High Church view as obligatory, or on the other hand to exclude it as untenable, would inevitably have the effect of splitting the Church of England from end to end.

It is to be noted, further, that at the time of the Reformation the Church of England was given a new Ordinal, in which the late mediæval emphasis upon the idea of the offering of sacrifice as being the primary function of those ordained to the priesthood is tacitly abandoned, and the ministry of the

[1] I here quote from my own pamphlet *Episcopacy and the Anglican Tradition*, published by the Church Missionary Society (1954).

[2] J. M. Ross, 'The Attitude of the Protestant Reformation to Episcopacy' (*Friends of Reunion Bulletin*, xlviii. 22).

[3] 1833 was the date of John Keble's famous Assize Sermon on National Apostasy.

Sacraments is set firmly in the context of the ministry of the Word. Roman Catholic controversialists on this ground deny the validity of Anglican ordinations, holding that the 'intention' of the Anglican Church in ordaining was at the Reformation fatally changed. The Anglican rejoinder is that the intention of the Church to ordain to the ministry of Word and Sacraments in accordance with the mind of Christ is in the Anglican Ordinal unquestionable, and that the Reformation change of emphasis represented merely a clearing away of mediæval accretions. The doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice in the form which by the end of the mediæval period it had come to assume is not held to-day by responsible Anglican theologians, though the holding of the doctrine of Sacrifice in some more defensible form is of course normal in Anglicanism of the 'Anglo-Catholic' or 'High Church' type. Between the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice as held by scholarly Anglo-Catholics to-day and the doctrine set forth by the late Professor Donald M. Baillie in the chapter headed 'The Eucharistic Offering' in his posthumous book on the Sacraments there is as little difference as makes no matter.[1]

From all this it seems to emerge that, as between Anglican and Presbyterian divines at the present time, there are few, if any, inevitable divergences, though of course the Presbyterians could not be expected to endorse the exclusive Tractarian view of the Episcopate. The real question at issue is whether they need go so far in their rejection of it as to refuse to be in communion, on the basis of a mutually acceptable form of Episcopal Order, with a Church in which such a view is permissible, and is in fact widely held. Those who took part on behalf of the Church of Scotland and of the Presbyterian Church of England in the recent Anglican-Presbyterian inter-Church Conversations did not think so. It was held that in the context (a) of the Ecumenical Movement, (b) of the revived interest in Biblical theology which has been a notable feature of the last few decades, and (c) of an atmosphere of assured friendship, a 'new appraoch' had become possible. A number of important 'Biblical and doctrinal considerations concerning the Church and its ministry' were able to be formulated in an agreed statement. The Anglicans recognized that Presbyterians certainly hold a firm, clear and positive doctrine alike of the Church and of its Ministry, and that the functions ascribed to the Ministry are under both systems in essentials the same. In neither Church in the local church, or the individual minister, left without 'oversight' (*episcope*). 'In the Presbyterian Churches' (to quote the words of the *Report*) 'the ministers of the Word and Sacraments exercise a corporate episcopate, collectively through the Presbytery, along with the lay elders associated with them... In the Anglican Churches there is the distinctive office of the Bishop the essence of' which 'lies in the coalescence of certain functions in a single person.' The Anglican respresentatives were however 'anxious to emphasize that the Bishop's office is rightly exercised only within the context of the corporate life of the whole Church,' at the same time admitting that this principle 'has been too often obscured in practice.' It was frankly recognized that the purely administrative functions of the Bishop's office could well be exercised through the corporate oversight of Presbytery, but the Anglicans believed that the more directly pastoral functions of *episcope* can be better exercised by a permanent 'Father in God' than by a Presbytery presided over by a Chairman or Moderator holding only a brief temporary office. There was further the question of the effective linking on of the local ministry with the ministry of episcopal Churches in different parts of the world which have preserved, and which highly value, continuity with the ministry of pre-Reformation times through ordination by Bishops standing in the historic episcopal succession.

It was found in the Conference that 'on the Presbyterian side there was a willingness to consider the functions of a Bishop, as they are recognized by the Anglican Communion, so long as the office was duly integrated with the Presbytery and the whole Church,' and on the Anglican side there was a corresponding willingness 'to consider the complementing and strengthening of the episcopate in Anglican Churches by ensuring the corporate functioning of *episcope* through developments within the existing order corresponding to the sacral courts of the Church as found within the Presbyterian order.' It was suggested, in short, that the

[1] D. M. Baillie, *The Theology of the Sacraments* (1957), Lecture V

Presbyterian Churches might be prepared to consider the acceptance of the 'historic episcopate' on the understanding that the Bishop would function strictly as a presiding Bishop in Presbytery,' and that the Anglican Churches on their side should be encouraged to consider the development of a form of order in which ministry and laity should be closely linked together in decisions concerned with the government and doctrine of the Church at all levels. This would mean, for example, that in the Church of England a lay element, such as already exists in the Church Assembly, should be introduced also into the Convocations of Canterbury and York in association with the existing Houses of Bishops and Clergy: and that consideration should be given to the possibility of the development in Anglican Churches of an office corresponding to that of the lay 'elder' in Presbyterianism.

On both sides those who took part in the Conferences and who produced the Report have been greatly encouraged by the decisions taken in both England and Scotland to commend the Joint Report for study and careful consideration, in the atmosphere of prayer, by the rank and file of Church members. They have expressed, in the Report itself, their strong hope that 'at a later stage, and consequent upon such study and examination, the four Churches, if they all agree, should make together a solemn resolve to seek reconciliation and unity with one another.' At the same time it should be recognized that what is envisaged is *not* 'one single "Church of Great Britain," but rather a "Church of England" and a "Church of Scotland" in full communion with one another in the one Church of Christ.' The proposed modifications 'do not involve a uniformity of life and worship throughout these Churches, but rather the freedom of each Church under God to continue and develop in its own full inheritance of life and worship throughout its parishes and congregations. What is envisaged in these modifications is a *fulness of sacramental communion* between these two Churches, involving a fully authorized interchange of communicants and mutual recognition of ministries.' May God prosper and guide the deliberations of the four Churches concerned!

Letter To The Editor

Dear Mr. Editor,

As I find that some readers have been disturbed by some views expressed in the article which I contributed to the August, 1957, issue, I should be grateful if you would allow me to say that in writing I was expressing my own views and that I cannot pretend in any official way to commit either the Church to which I belong or the Negotiating Committee to any views or interpretations which I contribute. That, I think, is usually understood.

Yours sincerely,

T. Donald Sully

The Rev. E. L. Wenger, who has been the Convener of the Baptist delegation to the Negotiating Committee for some years, and a frequent contributor to 'Church Union News and Views', leaves for furlough in England as this issue goes to press. Mr. P. Adhikari of Calcutta has been appointed to succeed Mr. Wenger as Convener of the Church Union Committee of the Council of Baptist Churches in Northern India.

The Board of the Christian Retreat and Study Centre, Rajpur, (near Dehra Dun, U.P. has very generously offered to provide accommodation at the centre and meet the expense of a group of about 15 representatives from the Negotiating Churches who will come together in June or July to study the Plan together, with a view to being better able to educate the members of their Churches. This is on the lines of a proposal which was made by the late Augustine Ralla Ram with a view to fostering more intelligent study of the Plan.

It looks as though dates in the second half of June may be most suitable, and any who would think of attending such a conference are asked to communicate with the Secretary, the Ven'ble Dr. T. D. Sully, 4 Queen's Road, Allahabad, as soon as possible. Further information will be sent.

Our former Secretary, the Rev. W. Machin, was able to attend an interesting discussion group on the N. I. & P. Plan of Church Union, held at St. Augustine's College, Canterbury. There were five Anglican representatives, including Bishop Noel Hall, a Cowley Father, and the Secretary of the Church Union ; two Baptists, one Congregationalist and one Methodist. There seems to have been very full and frank discussion, and Mr. Machin comments as follows,— The Baptist view that the early Church was 'baptist' in practice was sharply challenged by others, and the point was made how seriously paedo-baptists feel the fact that in the Church of N. India/Pakistan there would be children kept back from baptism.

It was recognised that some dislike the notion that there is any element of 'ordination' about the rite of unification of the Ministry, but in a rite that is intended to add to minister's authority, especially since it concerns both kinds of authority, there must surely be something of the nature of ordination. There is I am sure confusion, Mr. Machin says, about the two kinds of ministerial authority,— the authority to be a minister at all, and the authority to work as a minister in a particular Church or place. They must be kept clear. I think the rite of unification of the ministry deals more with the former. An Anglican member put it that even if a rite may have more than one interpretation, that does not matter so long as the fact is recognised and made plain, as we have tried to make it. The main thing is " what God requires, not what any section of Christians, however sure they may be of their position, desires or even requires. "

T. D. S.

The Statement about ownership and other particulars about the magazine entitled " Church Union—News and Views " as required to be published under Rule 8 of the Registration of Newspapers (Central) Rules 1956.

FORM IV

1.	Place of Publication	Masha'l Printing Press, Kharar, Ambala Dist.
2.	Periodicity of its publication	Quarterly
3.	Printer's Name	A. M. Barnabas,
	Nationality	Indian
	Address	Masha'l Printing Press, Kharar, Ambala Dist.
4.	Publisher's Name	A. M. Barnabas,
	Nationality	Indian
	Address	Masha'l Printing Press, Kharar, Ambala Dist.
5.	Editor's Name	B. F. Price
	Nationality	British
	Address	Serampore College, Serampore, West Bengal.

I, A. M. Barnabas, hereby declare that the particulars given above are true to best of my knowledge and belief.

Signature of Publisher

Date 15-5-58

Sd. A. M. Barnabas

Writers in this Number

The Right Reverend W.Q. Lash is the Bishop of Bombay (Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon)

The Reverend W. Stewart, M. A., B. D., is on the staff of Serampore College, and is the Editor of Church Union News and Views (at present on furlough)

The Reverend E. L. Wenger is on the staff of Serampore College.

The Right Reverend A. E. J. Rawlinson, D. D., is Bishop of Derby and is the Chairman of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Committee of Theologians.

The Venerable T. D. Sully, M. A., D. Litt., is Archdeacon of Lucknow and Secretary of the Negotiating Committee.

Now on Sale.

The Plan of Church Union in North India and Pakistan

Third Edition

Price Re. 1/- per copy.

Services Proposed for use at the Inauguration of the Church of North India and the Church of Pakistan

and the Service for the Ordination of Presbyters in these United Churches Revised 1957

Price 75 nP. per copy.

Order through your local Christian Book Shop or directly from the Publishers :

THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY,
P. O. Box 501, Park Town, Madras.

Also Available

Urdu Translation of Plan of Church Union in North India and Pakistan.
Pakistani edition Part I—Constitution 4 as. Part II—Inauguration of Union 2 as.
Obtainable from Punjab Religious Book Society, Lahore.

Indian Edition (Urdu) 31. n.p. obtainable from Mash'al Printing Press, Kharar, Ambala Dt.

Hindi Translation of Plan of Church Union in North India and Pakistan—31 n. p. per copy.

Obtainable from the Manager, Yogi Press, Lodipur G.P.O., Patna (also by V. P. P.)

and from North India Christian Tract and Book Society, 18 Clive Road, Allahabad.

Printed and published at the Masha'l Printing Press, Kharar, Dist. Ambala
by A. M. Barnabas, Printer and Publisher.